



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/645,293

08/20/2003

John R. Peery

ALE 053.16

7202

74866

7590

03/05/2009

Intarcia Therapeutics, Inc.  
ATTN: Barbara G. McClung  
24650 Industrial Blvd  
Hayward, CA 94545

EXAMINER

EBRAHIM, NABILA G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/05/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/645,293	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PEERY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Nabila G. Ebrahim	<b>Art Unit</b> 1618	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nabila G. Ebrahim  
Examiner: Eric Silverman.

(3) Barbara McClung.

(2) Gary Febian.

(4) Lautenbach Scott.

Date of Interview: 25 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 55, 52, 61, and 71.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant and Applicants representatives discussed the differences between the instant claims and the prior art cited in the office action (Laby, Portner and Magruder). Applicant and representatives emphasized two limitations, the back diffusion regulating outlet, and the semipermeable plug. Examiner Silverman advised Applicant and Applicants representatives that the claims need language that better describes the instant claims to exclude the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Nabila G Ebrahim/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1618